

**COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT
AND REVENUE ADMINISTRATION**

November 15, 2005

5:00 PM

Chairman Smith called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Smith, Osborne, Shea, Thibault

Absent: Alderman Guinta

Messrs.: G. Beloin, S. Wickens

Chairman Smith addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Guy Beloin, Financial Analyst II, submitting the City's monthly financial statements for the four months ended October 31, 2005 for FY2006.

Guy Beloin, Financial Analyst II, stated I guess I'll start with the expenditures. The trend that we're seeing here is pretty much at the same as what we saw last year. For Risk Management, it looks like it might be over or running ahead of expected but then that's because they usually prepay insurance premiums at the beginning of the year. So that's why it was like that. There is probably being less of an affect. The Information Systems, they've recorded service agreements for the year support \$325,000. So again, it looks like that they're percentage left is lower than it really is. Human Resources, on the plus side, got a \$413,000 check from Anthem for the month of August for estimated clients. Last year we were always having to pay an additional premium pretty much every month. Building Maintenance, they have not prepaid but then they've encumbered \$4 million worth of services at the beginning of the year, and Elderly Services, they've done the same for I believe utilities that would include the telephone and electric bills. Concerning revenues, the cable franchise fees it is like last year and that's due to payment that went to MCTV for \$231,000. That came out of the revenue line item. And the last thing that I have is the reimbursements. They are lower than last year due to I believe a baseball debt recovery payment debt. And last but not least, miscellaneous revenues. Last year we had \$200,000 more than we do have this year on excess receipts.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to accept the report.

Chairman Smith addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Sharon Wickens, Financial Analyst II, submitting reports as follows:

- a)department legend;
- b)open invoice report over 90 days by fund;
- c)open invoice report all invoices for interdepartmental billings only;
- d)open invoice report all invoices due from the School District only;
- e)listing of invoices submitted to City Solicitor for legal determination; and
- f)accounts receivable summary.

Sharon Wickens, Financial Analyst II, stated I have no specific comments on any specific accounts to bring to your attention. Maybe the accounts receivable summary, some of the larger receivables we have, but they're all coming in. So it's nothing to be concerned with.

Alderman Shea stated I've sat on this committee before and now and it seems like there's a lot of, I don't know what you may call it, duplication of paperwork and stuff like that. Is there any way that some how there could be some way or method so that all of these forms here that we see could somehow, I don't know how to do it...you know what I'm saying. Don't you find that there's a lot of repetition...I mean, does it help the process or...

Ms. Wickens responded well I think the reason...like the 90 day and over report, all the other reports are actually on that, the pieces of information that are on the 90 day and over report, but somewhere along the line one of the Aldermen must have said I want to see interdepartmental stuff separately, I want to see schools separately. Whatever you want to do or however you want me to present that, that's certainly... I can eliminate the reports or is there something specific you're looking for.

Alderman Shea replied well not necessarily, but I'm wondering how much time does your office consume in this type of a process that they could probably more profitably use their time doing something else. I'm not saying that...but in the ledger of one to ten, this seems to me to be like nine and a half.

Ms. Wickens stated no it's more paper than it is time. They are pretty much canned reports at this point. They just spit out automatically, so it doesn't take me a lot of time to get them, but it is a lot of paper. I can try to look at different ways.

Alderman Shea stated well I'd make a suggestion, not a motion, but a suggestion if anyway that your office can come up with some type of method of means of reducing the amount of duplication of paperwork, it might make it easier for future members of either this particular committee or the Board in general. That's why I'm suggesting it.

Ms. Wickens stated I'm all for making things easy, so sure, I'll take a look at that.

Chairman Smith stated just a follow up. I believe we met on this and I thought that a wise decision would be to summarize the financial charges because there's one company that has over 125 transaction amounts that haven't been paid and I think if you summarize it and put it down like 125 with a certain amount would help to reduce the financial charges. Because I'm looking at it right now and it's about two pages.

Ms. Wickens stated right. That's something that has to be looked at. Unfortunately some of the customers are paying their bills, but they're just saying we're not going to pay the finance charges, and that particular one is one of those customers. But maybe we could summarize them.

Alderman Osborne stated on the open invoices, nothing's changed since the last time we met. On the schools, so on and so forth here.

Ms. Wickens replied no it seems like the departments are finally catching up on their billing, so they're billing them more frequently, so now they're starting to have a balance of what's coming in. but they're right on top of it. School is doing really well.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to accept the report.

Chairman Smith addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Sharon Wickens, Financial Analyst II, submitting the 1st quarter FY2006 write off list for the accounts receivable module.

Ms. Wickens stated before we open it up for discussion, I just want to make one comment. This may be a little bit higher than we normally see, \$7,000, but we

haven't had a write-off listing go before this committee since April, so it is a little bit more. And we also have procedures in place that after 90 days each customers items go to collection and when they send it back and said there's nothing we can do with it, this committee has requested that I do one of two things. Either if it's under \$1,000, put it on this write-off listing, if it's over \$1,000, send it to the Solicitor's office. I do as you say, but I do have a couple on here that are on the write-off listing because they don't meet the \$1,000 criteria, however, they are reputable companies. I would like to send them to the Solicitor's office. The three of them are under the Fire Department; Fleet Bank, So. Willow EDF, which is Stop N Shop, and CP Management. I really don't think that those are lost cause accounts. I don't want to write them off. I do want to send them to the Solicitor's office, if you're all right with that.

Chairman Smith asked would everyone concur with that.

Alderman Thibault asked why is it that we can't send some of these accounts that you figure are dead and we're going to lose anyway, why couldn't we send them to a collection agency. We'd certainly get a percentage.

Ms. Wickens replied all of these that are on the write-off listing have been to the collection agency. When they get to a point where there's nothing more that they can do other than take them to court, they don't have that authority to take them court. So they throw them back to us. Now the Solicitor's office doesn't want to see every little \$30.00 collection because it takes a lot of their time, so they've established a criteria of \$1,000, and this committee agreed with that at the time.

Alderman Osborne asked do you figure they know this particular situation, where we're going to write it off.

Ms. Wickens replied I don't think that they think that we're going to write this off. These companies here?

Alderman Osborne replied in general. Just everything in general. After you put it through a collection agency and after they can't collect it, you say it's tossed back to us.

Ms. Wickens replied I would say that the bulk of the customers assume that...well they don't know that we're going to write it off, they don't know that we're not going to send it to our Solicitor's office. I mean I never tell anybody that I'm going to write anything off.

Alderman Osborne asked is any of this go onto anybody's credit history?

Ms. Wickens replied the collection agency supposedly they just will mark it down that the City of Manchester are trying to collect on them. And I know that they do this because every once in a while somebody must be trying to get a loan or something and they'll call and I'll be able to look back and say oh yes you owe us.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to accept the report with the exception of the following accounts: Fleet Bank, So. Willow EDF LLC (Stop N Shop) and CP Management to be forwarded to the Solicitor's office for collection.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee